

# CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with  
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 19

November 7, 2017

275 Pages

## Table of Contents

### CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bagley v. Adel Wiggins Group, 327 C 89 . . . . .	39
<i>Product liability; action pursuant to Connecticut's Product Liability Act (§ 52-572m et seq.) alleging wrongful death of decedent based on his exposure to defendant's allegedly defective asbestos containing product; motion for directed verdict; motion to set aside verdict and for judgment notwithstanding verdict; whether expert testimony was necessary to prove plaintiff's strict liability and negligence claims; whether plaintiff proved through competent expert testimony that defendant's product was dangerous and that product's dangerous condition caused decedent to develop mesothelioma; whether court's holding compelled by law as it existed at time of trial or whether it stemmed from principles newly articulated in court's recent product liability jurisprudence, entitling plaintiff to new trial.</i>	
Bank of New York Mellon v. Lindsey (Order), 327 C 931 . . . . .	69
Bigelow v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 929 . . . . .	67
Brander v. Stoddard (Order), 327 C 928 . . . . .	66
Cadle Co. v. Ogalin (Order), 327 C 930 . . . . .	68
Cimino v. Cimino (Order), 327 C 929 . . . . .	67
Dull v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 930 . . . . .	68
Financial Freedom Acquisition, LLC v. Griffin (Order), 327 C 931 . . . . .	69
Hynes v. Jones (Order), 327 C 930 . . . . .	68
Pascarella v. Silver (Order), 327 C 931 . . . . .	69
Rogers v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 929 . . . . .	67
Wellswood Columbia, LLC v. Hebron, 327 C 53 . . . . .	3
<i>Action to recover damages for temporary taking, temporary nuisance, and tortious interference with business expectancies; whether doctrine of res judicata barred plaintiffs' action; whether takings claim accrued after injunction had been issued in first action; whether accrual of takings claim was postponed because extent of plaintiffs' damages was uncertain; claim that defendant town's road closure constituted temporary nuisance or continuing or recurrent wrong; claim that there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether plaintiffs had sustained losses prior to first action for purposes of tortious interference with business expectancies claim; whether policies underlying res judicata supported its application in present case.</i>	
Volume 327 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	71

### CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Burke v. Mesniaeff, 177 CA 824 . . . . .	48A
<i>Assault and battery; claim that trial court improperly charged jury with respect to special defense of justification by incorporating charge on criminal trespass; whether jury was misled by court's instruction; claim that charge was improper because plaintiff did not have notice of statute on which justification special defense was grounded; whether plaintiff demonstrated that jury was misled or that she was harmed by court's use of term trespass in charge; claim that trial court improperly failed to charge jury that defendant had duty to retreat during subject incident; whether there was sufficient evidence in record on which jury reasonably could have determined that defendant was acting in defense of others during incident.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Deutsche Bank National Trust Co. v. Rodriguez (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 903 . . .	115A
Griswold v. Camputaro, 177 CA 779 . . . . .	3A
<i>Zoning enforcement action; zoning appeal; motion to open and modify judgment; motion to intervene pursuant to statute (§ 22a-19 [a] [1]); whether this court had jurisdiction to consider appeal by proposed intervenors who did not file petition for certification to appeal; whether proposed intervenors could intervene as matter of right in zoning enforcement action; whether appeal was moot; whether trial court improperly denied motions to intervene on ground that there was no pending proceeding; whether plaintiff and defendants, by filing request for earlier hearing without reasonable explanation, violated rules of practice and right of proposed intervenors to accurate and timely notice; claim that intervenors were denied vested statutory rights to be heard under § 22a-19 (a); claim that stipulated judgment was not rendered in compliance with statute (§ 8-8 [n]) that requires trial court to hold hearing and approve settlement; whether, pursuant to § 22a-19 (a), intervenors are entitled to participate for purpose of raising environmental issues.</i>	
Homeowners Finance Co. v. Reliable Mechanical Contractors, LLC (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 902 . . . . .	114A
HSBC Bank USA, National Assn., Successor Trustee v. Syms (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 903. . . . .	115A
Lalli v. McEnery (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 902 . . . . .	114A
Noze v. Commissioner of Correction, 177 CA 874 . . . . .	98A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner adequately as to immigration consequences of guilty plea; whether habeas court improperly determined that petitioner was not prejudiced by trial counsel's allegedly deficient performance.</i>	
Rodriguez v. Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 902 . . . . .	114A
State v. Neary, 177 CA 871 . . . . .	95A
<i>Motion to correct illegal sentence; whether appeal from denial of motion to correct illegal sentence was moot where defendant completed sentence, including period of conditional discharge.</i>	
State v. Ramos (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 904 . . . . .	116A
State v. Sienkiewicz, 177 CA 863 . . . . .	87A
<i>Assault in third degree; whether trial court improperly dismissed petition for writ of error coram nobis; whether trial court properly determined that it lacked jurisdiction over petition for writ of error coram nobis because defendant had adequate remedy at law in form of habeas corpus relief.</i>	
21st Century North American Ins. Co. v. Perez, 177 CA 802. . . . .	26A
<i>Declaratory judgment; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff automobile insurance company had not validly cancelled automobile insurance policy held by insured defendants; claim that partial payment by insured defendants following their default constituted substantial compliance that cured their breach; reviewability of unpreserved claims that cancellation notice failed to comply with</i>	

(continued on next page)

## CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications  
Office of Production and Distribution  
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453  
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178  
[www.jud.ct.gov](http://www.jud.ct.gov)

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*Published Weekly – Available at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by  
ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*  
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

<i>certain statutes; whether trial court's finding concerning amount due to plaintiff was clearly erroneous; whether trial court improperly applied doctrine of substantial compliance to excuse default by insured; whether doctrine of substantial compliance applied in context of payment of automobile insurance premiums on monthly installment basis; whether plaintiff demonstrated that it had validly cancelled insurance policy pursuant to terms of policy and applicable statutes (§§ 38a-342 and 38a-343).</i>	
Wells Fargo Bank, National Assn., Trustee v. Malik (Memorandum Decision), 177 CA 903	115A
Volume 177 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	117A
 Frauenglass & Associates, LLC v. Enagbare, 178 CA 35 . . . . .	161A
<i>Contracts; action to recover unpaid legal fees; whether claims regarding attorney's fees charged by plaintiff in underlying dissolution proceeding constituted improper collateral attack on underlying judgment; reviewability of claim of newly discovered evidence of fraudulent conduct by plaintiff; failure to file motion to open underlying judgment on basis of fraud; reviewability of claim made for first time on appeal.</i>	
Samakaab v. Dept. of Social Services, 178 CA 52 . . . . .	178A
<i>Employment discrimination; claim that defendant discriminated against plaintiff on basis of age, sex, national origin and prior opposition to unlawful employment practices in violation of Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act (§ 46a-51 et seq.); whether trial court properly determined that insufficient facts were presented to support prima facie case of discrimination or retaliation; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i>	
State v. Gill, 178 CA 43 . . . . .	169A
<i>Murder; sufficiency of evidence; claim that state presented insufficient evidence to prove that defendant intended to cause victim's death; consciousness of guilt evidence.</i>	
State v. Jackson, 178 CA 16 . . . . .	142A
<i>Murder; claim that trial court committed plain error in failing to give special accomplice credibility instruction regarding testimony of two witnesses; whether defendant failed to establish indisputable instructional error on part of trial court that was so clear and obvious as to require extraordinary remedy of reversal, as required under first prong of plain error doctrine; whether claim failed second prong of plain error doctrine because it did not result in manifest injustice; whether jury was presumed to have followed trial court's instructions.</i>	
State v. Torres, 178 CA 29 . . . . .	155A
<i>Murder; claim that certain portions of trial court's instruction to jury on reasonable doubt constituted plain error; claim that cumulative effect of subject portions of instruction constituted plain error; whether Appellate Court was bound by Supreme Court precedent.</i>	
Stephen J. R. v. Commissioner of Correction, 178 CA 1 . . . . .	127A
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; claim that habeas court improperly denied petition for certification to appeal after erroneously concluding that trial counsel had provided effective assistance despite decision not to consult with and present testimony of expert on false memory syndrome in child sexual assault cases.</i>	
Volume 178 Cumulative Table of Cases . . . . .	191A

### SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries . . . . .	1B
---------------------	----

### MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Acceptance of Resignation and Waiver . . . . .	2C
Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel . . . . .	2C
Notice of Disbarment of Attorney . . . . .	1C
Notice of Reprimand of Attorneys . . . . .	1C
Notice of Suspension of Attorney . . . . .	1C
Notice of Suspension . . . . .	3C